

*Draft Action/Summary Minutes*  
**City of Sedona**  
**Historic Preservation Commission Meeting**  
**City Council Chambers, Sedona City Hall, Sedona, AZ**  
**Monday, November 2, 2009 – 4:00 pm**

**1. Verification of notice, call to order, roll call and Pledge of Allegiance.**

Chairman Unger called the meeting to order at 4:22 p.m. The Chairman explained that the Commission currently has only four Commissioners and Commissioner Mayer will be here shortly; however, we will defer agenda items that require a vote until after his arrival.

**Roll Call:**

**Commissioners:** Chairman Brynn Unger, Vice Chairman Greg Ruland and Commissioner Noreen Wienges. Commissioner Richard Mayer - arrived at 4:40 p.m.

**Staff:** Kathy Levin and Donna Puckett

**2. Public forum for items not on agenda. Limit of 3 minutes per presentation. (Note that the Commission may not discuss or make any decisions on any matter brought forward by a member of the public).**

*The Chairman opened the public forum and having no requests to speak, closed the public forum.*

**4. Commission and staff announcements and summary of current matters.**

Kathy Levin thanked those people in the audience for waiting and announced that Friday was the deadline for applications for the three Historic Preservation Commission vacancies. We received two applications; one from Helen Snyder and one from John Sears, and the Chair of the Commission and two Council members will interview them to possibly be seated in December.

**6. Discussion/possible action on proposed revisions to the 2009-10 Historic Preservation Small Grant Program Application and Program Requirements regarding the number of grants for non-historic landmark properties, and, the need for a Certificate of Appropriateness.**

Kathy Levin indicated that at the last Commission meeting, there was a concern about the last review of applications for the Small Grant Program and about providing more than one grant to the owners of properties who had not sought landmark designation, so we decided to look at that. The current application weighting system provides 10 points to applicants who have not received funding within the prior year; it also provides 5 points if the property is a local, state or national Landmark, and lastly it provides 10 points if an application for Landmark designation is submitted with the grant request. In the case of the Unity Church or Bela Horvath's home and studio, they received 10 points for no prior year's funding; however, they had received two grants in two cycles in 2006, totaling \$3,750, and they scored competitively with the only other applicant, which was the Sedona Charter School's Bennett-Purtymun Cabin. Our history of this program does demonstrate that it has served as an incentive to landmark new properties. Since this program was initiated in 2006, five properties that received grants were designated in the last three years, so if the Commission is concerned that the program is not serving as an incentive, that is not borne

out; however, it does appear that one rogue applicant has applied and received three grants and consistently has not pursued landmark designation. It is not a widespread problem, but we probably should add language to address the situation. She has some suggested language for consideration, but she is only looking for a general consensus. Her suggested language would be under the Small Grant Program Requirements - Successive Year Grants and we would add the following language: "Applicants may receive only one grant if they have not filed the Landmark Designation Application, unless exigent circumstances exist.", or we can stop at "application", because we have other newer language that permits us to look at circumstances, such as what occurred with the Hart Store; however, she is thinking it may even need to be tighter than that. The Recording Secretary asked for the statement to be re-read, and then asked what that would do in the future if they applied, but were denied landmark status. The Chairman indicated that seemed to cover it, if they have not received the grant in the past, because it would be only one grant. Vice Chairman Ruland clarified that the point is that they would have filed for designation, so having filed, they would have met the threshold, and would be entitled to come back again and again. Once you were turned down, you could come back, under that wording. The Chairman agreed; the only thing it actually prevents is getting the grant. Vice Chairman Ruland asked how it prevents them from getting more than one grant and Kathy pointed out that it says if you haven't filed. The Chairman agreed that they could keep filing, until they got the grant, but once they got it, they could not get another grant. Vice Chairman Ruland indicated that is not the way he reads it.

Kathy indicated that our process for landmark designation has usually been a mutual one, but sometimes we have people step forward and ask us to consider their properties, so it runs both ways. She doesn't know that anyone who has filed for landmark designation has denied since 1998, but that is not to say that it couldn't happen and she has recommended denial based on narrow criteria, as she did with the Doodlebug Ranch, but you appropriately overruled that recommendation. She will work on more language, if you share that concern. The Chairman asked if staff would be addressing if someone wants to be landmarked, but can't be landmarked, although it is a significant home that we would give a grant to, so we would be allowed to give that grant. Kathy clarified that is what has to be determined, because she can think of properties that have been modified so much, like some of the Schnebly properties, which you may want to preserve, but wouldn't qualify for landmark designation, because of the substantive modifications that have occurred. You might see value in that historic resource, but it would not be landmark worthy. She thinks we want to get away from putting money into properties and using it as an incentive, when there isn't a serious desire to follow-through.

Chairman Unger explained that one of the difficulties is if we are giving money to something that isn't landmarked locally, they can still change that property and we have no control over that, and we want to maintain these homes in the way they were built, so her concern is that if we find that we are going to award it outside of that, certainly the Commission can say that we are uncomfortable with it at that point, but it is whether or not we want to tighten the language enough or loosen it enough to give a grant to a house that may in the future even be demolished. Kathy indicated that there are some properties that we know are landmark-eligible, but there are others that fall into another category that may have had modifications, so the Commission needs to determine if they are still suitable, but we don't make those determinations, when they file for an application. We have said it is meant to be an incentive, but we are looking at those in the survey, those we know to be historic and those that have already received either local or national landmark recognition.

Commissioner Wienges asked if there is a different way to look at this and suggested looking at the point system and somehow weighting it in favor of someone who is serious about landmarking. Kathy indicated there is, and that might be a better way to get at it; she will look at it again. Vice Chairman Ruland asked if we have limited resources in the fund, why we don't just preserve it for landmarked properties, and Kathy explained that when this was originally presented to the City Council, it was truly to be an incentive to have property owners seriously considering landmarking their properties. We wanted to put money into lasting resources and use that to encourage owners to consider that, and we have had multiple grants to landmarked properties and have significantly contributed to their preservation, so she doesn't know that we want to dilute that in any way.

Vice Chairman Ruland indicated that going back through the point weighting system for properties that have not been landmarked and have not applied to be landmarked seems like a lot of staff and Commission time to make a decision about somebody who is not serious about landmarking the property. It should at least be linked to an application for landmark accompanying that request for money, even if they are not eligible, we could make that judgment and still say this is a good project, and then going forward, your point is well taken, we are giving money to people whose homes haven't been landmarked; they don't want to apply, and it might be torn down or remodeled as soon as it is sold, and then the money we spent to preserve it hasn't gone to someone perhaps who is serious about landmarking. He is just concerned because of our limited resources and our ability to get grant funding that if we go too far afield of landmark properties, we are not spending the money properly.

Chairman Unger indicated that issue is also why we created this in the first place; we really created it to incentivize and if we aren't demanding that they apply for landmark, then that incentive is no longer there and it wouldn't be working as strongly as an incentive as it could be. Kathy Levin pointed out that this is a stand-out applicant; it is really one of one. Through last year's funding, in the course of three years, the City of Sedona and the Commission have provided \$37,000 in small grants, and the total project cost of those grants was \$97,000; there were 13 grants, 8 properties, and 5 were landmarked, so there has been substantial leveraging of public and private funds to accomplish this.

Chairman Unger indicated that if staff is looking for a consensus, she would ask what the Commissioners would like for staff to come back with. Vice Chairman Ruland expressed that he would like to consider the point mechanism as a possible way to handle it, but his first preference would be to link any grant money to an application and they come in together at the same time. Chairman Unger suggested wording it that way, and then also as a point program, because she also leans toward what Vice Chairman Ruland is saying. Commissioner Wienges indicated that she agreed and that Vice Chairman Ruland's point is valid about not taking up too much staff or Commission time. The Chairman confirmed for the record, that while it would say the application should be attached, landmarked properties are already included.

Kathy indicated that she will bring this back to one of the subsequent meetings and thanked the Commission for the input. She also indicated there is a second part to this agenda item and referenced page 2 of the small grant requirements that address the project timeframe and includes the language, "Where applicable, a Certificate of Appropriateness application for an existing local historic Landmark property is submitted and approved in a public hearing by the HPC", and explained that we have not used this process yet, and the newly revised program requirements have relied upon staff and Commission review and approval

of the materials after the grant award is made and before the work begins. A Certificate of Appropriateness process is invoked with the landmarked property that is going to do modifications. It is a public hearing process, so she wanted to ask if the Commission is comfortable making a judgment call on each application as to the suitability at the time of the grant filing or whether the applicant should also file a Certificate of Appropriateness. It seems too late in the game to be at the end of the process, after you have made an award, but she is asking for feedback on using our best judgment when the applications come in, to determine if we also want them to file for a certificate when their grant request would require modifications that would be invoked by the Land Development Code, and then not have that at the end of the process, have a concurrent process.

Chairman Unger indicated that it needs to be that way, and it can easily be taken care of as we are looking at the grant; we should possibly always make that a point to talk about whether or not we need a Certificate of Appropriateness at the same time. Kathy explained that usually the applicant makes an appointment with staff and we determine the scope of the work and tell them if it is eligible or not, so we have an early reading on that.

*No legal action was taken.*

**8. Discussion/possible action on revisions to 2009-10 Work Plan including the use of incentives for historic landmark properties.**

Chairman Unger indicated she didn't know if the Commissioners read the information that Kathy distributed via email about the past work done on incentives. This issue was brought up at the beginning of the founding of the Commission, as to how we could find incentives, and when she first joined, a huge amount of time was spent trying to come up with different things and having the City Council back them off. If you read the information, you know where this went.

Kathy explained that incentives have appeared in the Community Plan for a decade as one of the HPC goals, and then staff started researching them in 2002, and in 2005, we carried proposed revisions to Planning & Zoning and the City Council. One incentive was the one she brought back to the Commission today. Ultimately, the City Council deferred taking action and subsequent to that, they funded the Commission with the \$15,000 Small Grant Assistance Program; however, one property owner has consistently ask Community Development to re-look at this; she has an historic landmarked property in Uptown, and it would be suitable for a B&B; however, those are not allowed in residential districts. They are in Special Planning Areas with a public hearing and zoning process.

She brought this back to the Commission to ask if you want to consider bringing this incentive forward again and having a discussion with the City Council at your joint meeting. It would provide an incentive for landmarked properties, but only if they are a designated local historic Landmark, if it is owner occupied and if it is no more than 2 units. It would be a Conditional Use process and would be heard in a Planning & Zoning public hearing, and a Conditional Use Permit is typically given for a period of years with conditions attached to it, and if everything goes well and there are no neighborhood issues that arise thereafter, then it continues to be renewed for however long the Commission determines. It would take two actions; one would be a Minor Amendment to the Community Plan, which she would take forward with your recommendations to Planning & Zoning and Council, and then it would require an amendment to the Land Development Code. She suggested language that is very limited, to allow a local historic landmark

building in single-family residential areas to be used as a Bed & Breakfast establishment with a two-unit maximum, with a Conditional Use Permit. There are many areas where this would not apply, such as where CC&Rs would prohibit this, but there aren't many historic resources in those areas. She did a lot of research on this and about 14 other incentives in 2005 and mapped them and analyzed them, but she would have to do that all over again to see which properties may have changed, etc. Some of the concerns that Council raised then, which she would expect them to raise again, is whether our criteria is strong enough, although it mirrors the national standards; whether there would be too many possible B&Bs, and is there a way to control that; how this may negatively impact neighborhoods; should there be a specific distance between properties or even a sunset clause on the legislation itself, and what the traffic impacts would be?

She is recommending that you consider including that for discussion with Council next week. We haven't talked about it in four years; however, there are a few holdovers from that discussion that are still on the Council and would remember that, but for today, she would ask that the Commission discuss whether or not you feel that is a valid incentive to bring forward again. Chairman Unger indicated that regarding the concern that there could be too many of these; there are so few that are close to one another, it doesn't look like that would happen.

Commissioner Wienges indicated it is a good idea for us to be looking at other incentives, which is what we have been talking about and that is creative thinking, but she is wondering what the ultimate outcome would be; you said there is one property that has shown an interest, so that is good for one property, but how many issues would come up, when we are considering a new landmarked property that neighborhoods may react more negatively against, because they are afraid that they will have all of these B&Bs, so she questions it, but she doesn't really know where she stands on it.

Kathy Levin explained that it would take a willing owner to participate as a manager of a B&B; of the few homes that we have recently landmarked, she would guess that with their current owners, none of them would move forward. Doodlebug Ranch may be different, because there is an ancillary building there, so to help in the analysis, we would want to look at those individual properties that are currently in residential districts, to see how they may differ one from the other, because we would want to describe the landscape before taking it forward, and this allows you to do the analysis, so you can analyze some of those concerns, and that is a really valid concern.

Vice Chairman Ruland indicated he would support the incentive wholeheartedly, it seems that the criteria you have described has narrowed the scope down to such a small limited number that he can't imagine that we are going to run into a proliferation of B&Bs in a neighborhood. It seems if that was an issue, why not have distances between them; there would be ways to handle that upfront, to say you don't qualify, because we already have two in this neighborhood. That is a great incentive.

Kathy indicated that initially she would go through the survey and look at those properties that are in residential areas, to see the quantity, make-up, how many are already landmarked and how many would be eligible, because we have resources that would not meet our eligibility criteria. Chairman Unger indicated she is in favor of that and asked if we have enough background to have a discussion with the City Council. Kathy indicated that we would be asking for two things, to give direction to staff to do the research and to bring it forward, after it came back to you for further discussion. It would be a discussion

in broad terms, not in specific terms, because staff has to be given direction to even work in that area, since it is outside of the scope of what Council priorities are right now. Chairman Unger indicated that since the three Commissioners are interested in it, it would be worthwhile going forward with taking a look at it. Kathy indicated that we would do the research, and then the Commission would determine if it should be pushed through.

*No legal action was taken and Commissioner Mayer arrived at 4:40 p.m.*

5. **PUBLIC HEARING: Discussion/possible action regarding a request for Historic Landmark Designation approval of the Ralph Block House (ca. 1953) and property. The subject property is further identified as Assessor's Parcel 408-11-431D Yavapai County). Case No.: HL 09-03 (Register Number 022), Applicant: Pamela and William Gunning, Address: 355 Arroyo Piñon, Sedona, Arizona 86336**

Chairman Unger reviewed the procedure that would be followed for the public hearing.

**Presentation, Kathy Levin:** Kathy Levin provided an overview of the request for landmark designation of the Ralph Block House - Arroyo Piñon Ranch, as presented in the Staff Report prepared for November 2, 2009; however, she questioned the reference to the Coconino Board of Supervisors in February 1967 and indicated it must have been the Yavapai County Board of Supervisors, in conjunction with the approval of Arroyo Piñon Drive and noted that one month later, Ralph and Marion Block created the 30-lot Arroyo Piñon subdivision, which was one of the earliest subdivisions in the 1950s and 1960s.

Kathy indicated that staff is supportive of designating the Ralph Block House as an historical landmark and recommends the Commission's approval. She also noted the references listed in the Staff Report and added that she had a telephone conversation with Jean Frank, a neighbor, and a telephone call from Mr. Ted Wolff in response to our public notification to adjacent homes in the area, and he asked about the easement that serves this property and others, and asked if the designation would affect that. She conferred with the Assistant City Attorney and was told it would have no affect one way or the other.

**Commission's Questions of Staff:** There were no questions asked of staff.

**Applicant, Bill Gunning, Sedona, AZ:** Introduced his wife, Pam Gunning, and indicated that he prepared a statement and provided copies to the Commission and Recording Secretary. He and his wife, as members of the National Trust for Historic Preservation and the Sedona Historical Society, endorse the concept of preservation and enjoy the challenge of restoring older properties. He and Pam feel the Ralph Block House, their home, is a property that should be preserved for future generations. It is one of only a few original Sedona ranch houses that remain; the home was constructed by Mr. Block in 1949, according to Reed Hallock, and he also told Mr. Gunning that the ranch was 69 acres in size and included 1,000 acres to 2,000 acres of leased land that went all the way to Red Rock Crossing, and he would know, because he was very good friends with Mr. Block. Mr. Block ran cattle on his ranch and rode his horse to work. The interior and exterior of the house are largely unaltered. It is a living tribute to the true western Arizona lifestyle of the 1940s and 1950s. In the last 25 years, living here in Sedona, he has witnessed what has happened to many of the older Sedona homes. Many of the beautiful, older buildings have been erased.

**Applicant, Pam Gunning, Sedona, AZ:** Added that they consider this a loss to their community; the early buildings must be preserved and they hope you choose to designate the Ralph Block Ranch House historic property.

**Commission's Questions of the Applicant:**

There were no questions asked, and Chairman Unger and Vice Chairman Ruland thanked the applicants for their heartfelt letter and their work in discovering all of the background for their home.

*The Chairman opened the public comment portion of the hearing and having no requests to speak, closed the public comment period.*

**Summary Discussion:**

Commissioner Wienges indicated that she had visited the property and she was very impressed by how much of the original has been preserved and how lovingly the owners have dedicated themselves to trying to preserve this. It is a beautiful home in a beautiful location and the original materials are very impressive. It says a lot about the history, as described in Kathy's Staff Report.

Commissioner Mayer noted that it is unusual that an historic home has the interior as intact as this does; we have seen a few that haven't been altered on the exterior, but almost invariably they have been remodeled on the interior, so it is a complete package in that respect, and we thank you for keeping it that way.

Chairman Unger stated that she is impressed that this house also is intact on the exterior, because often a house in that type of location would have been demolished to build something huge, which wouldn't have been appropriate, so we all want to thank you for taking care of that property the way you have, as well as the people who had it before you.

***MOTION:*** Commissioner Wienges moved to approve the landmark designation for Case Number HL 09-03 (Historic Register No. 022) to designate the Ralph Block House located at 355 Arroyo Piñon Drive as an historic landmark based upon the consistency with the historic landmark evaluation criteria outlined in the Sedona Land Development Code. Vice Chairman Ruland seconded the motion. ***VOTE:*** Motion carried unanimously four (4) for and zero (0) opposed.

**3. Consent agenda:**

**a. Approval of minutes of October 12, 2009 meeting.**

Chairman Unger indicated this item is for the approval of the minutes of the October 12, 2009 minutes.

***MOTION:*** Vice Chairman Ruland moved to approve. Commissioner Mayer seconded the motion. ***VOTE:*** Motion carried unanimously four (4) for and zero (0) opposed.

**7. Discussion/possible action on an application for the 2009-10 Historic Preservation Small Grant Program.**

Kathy Levin indicated that the guidelines for the Small Grant Program were revised at your October 8th meeting to be able to respond to emergency situations and to make a recommendation for funding to the Director of Community Development to waive the other requirements. The language added, which would govern any decisions you might make

tonight, reads as follows: "At the recommendation of the Historic Preservation Commission, the Director of Community Development has the discretion to modify or waive on a case-by-case basis any requirements as outlined in the Small Grant Program requirements due to special circumstances, such as financial hardship, significant structural damage or other exigent circumstances. The exercise of discretion places an emphasis on addressing the needs of local historic landmark properties and those listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Such modification or waiver considerations may include, but are not limited to, eligibility requirements, total grant awarded, and owner contribution and reimbursement requirements."

Kathy explained that the Small Grant Program was funded with \$12,000 for fiscal year 2009-2010, and the Commission has made two awards, one for \$1,324 and the other for \$1,567, totaling \$2,891, so there is a balance of \$9,109 in the Small Grant Fund today. We received an application from the owners of the historic Hart Store to replace wood floors damaged in the September 10th flood, and she included the application. They provided two quotes for materials only for the wood floors. The first quote was for \$16,722 and the second was for \$19,200. The Commission has the discretion to recommend an award of \$5,000 or more, and the applicant will also receive \$3,780 from the CLG grant approved by the state on a reimbursement basis, in the same manner as this program operates. The full cost of restoration following the flood is in the tens of thousands. The applicant is present, if you wish to hear more about the particular circumstances, but you are being asked to consider a small grant for this applicant.

Commissioner Mayer asked if this includes subflooring and floor joists, and Kathy indicated that she would look at the bid. The Commissioner indicated that it just says the flooring, and he was just curious to know if the subfloor and floor joists had to be replaced. Kathy indicated that she would defer to the applicant on that.

*The Chairman opened the public comment period at this time.*

**Jac Robson, Sedona, AZ:** Explained that it is a heart pine that was reclaimed, and this particular floor was brought out from Chicago. It was in the old Spiegel building that was built about when the store was built, and they sliced the beams to get the floor that was in the store. Commissioner Mayer asked if there is a concrete slab and Mr. Robson stated yes, but it was primitively done. They basically framed the building around boulders, and then they poured the concrete flooring, and over the years, it was all broken up in pieces, so they re-poured a self-leveling floor on top of it, and then they put an asphalt emulsion and a Visqueen vapor barrier down, with three-quarter inch plywood on top of that, and then the pine floor on top of that.

The Chairman asked if he had to replace any of the plywood, etc. Mr. Robson explained that the reason they haven't done any more on the flooring is that some of the subfloor has been buckled or delaminated and needs to be pulled up and the question has been how much money they are going to have to fix this. They are just going day-to-day, but if they can afford to do the flooring again, which had bids of around \$40,000, they had thought about putting some linoleum in, but it didn't look right. They had nothing but compliments about the wood floor, so it has been a sad thing, because he put the floor down and it just enhanced the building.

*The Chairman closed the public comment period.*



Vice Chairman Ruland asked staff to repeat how much is left in the fund, and Kathy stated \$9,109. The Vice Chairman indicated he would favor awarding that amount.

***MOTION: Vice Chairman Ruland moved to award \$9,109. Commissioner Wienges seconded the motion.***

Commissioner Mayer asked if any of that money is needed for plaques, etc., and Kathy explained there is a separate line item for supplies, which is \$3,000 for this fiscal year; however, we are going to have to reduce that line item, because of the decrease in revenues. That item was specifically for plaques and the Historic Preservation Month activities next May, so the funds don't cross over. The Chairman confirmed the Small Grant Program fund is only for grants, and Kathy indicated the Doodlebug plaque would be \$300, and then there would be this most recently designated property.

Vice Chairman Ruland indicated that in support of the motion, the property is clearly an asset to the community, and the gentleman's hard work is unfathomable in what he has been through, and we should grant this money before somebody tries to take it back. He can't think of a better place to put this money and it is a drop in the bucket compared to the rest of their expenses. The Chairman agreed that we need to concentrate on the buildings that deserve our attention and this is certainly one of them. Kathy Levin pointed out that the Commission can also waive the matching requirements, and Vice Chairman Ruland stated that he amends his motion to waive the matching requirements. The second (Commissioner Wienges) agreed to the change.

***AMENDED MOTION: Vice Chairman Ruland moved to award \$9,109 and waive the matching requirements. Commissioner Wienges seconded the amended motion.***

Kathy Levin suggested using the recommended language for the motion, because it is really a recommendation to the Director of Community Development.

***SECOND AMENDED MOTION: Vice Chairman Ruland moved to recommend to the Director of Community Development that a grant award in the amount of \$9,109.00 (Nine Thousand One Hundred and Nine Dollars) be awarded to the owners of the Hart Store, waiving the owner matching requirements and grant ceiling, to replace the interior wood flooring due to the damage caused by the September 10, 2009 flood to the Hart Store, a local historic landmark listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The second (Commissioner Wienges) agreed to the changes to the amended motion. VOTE: Second Amended Motion carried unanimously four (4) for and zero (0) opposed.***

**9. Discussion/possible action on topics and issues for discussion at the joint City Council Meeting on November 9, 2009.**

Chairman Unger distributed copies of the PowerPoint presentation and Kathy explained the purpose and format of the joint meetings with the City Council, noting that it is helpful for each Commissioner to participate in the discussion. Kathy explained that the Mayor has requested that all PowerPoint presentations only be used as prompts, so she and the Chairman have included the work plan with the Small Grant Program awards, the national nomination, the two grants prepared for the state's nomination of the Saddlerock Ranch, the annual conferences, the properties landmarked since the last joint meeting, Don Woods's early work, the education outreach, the first permanent display of photographs in the Council Chambers, the Commission's responsibility to review current projects, and

incentives. She has prepared a 9-slide PowerPoint, in case the Commission wishes to use it as a framework for discussion. The first provides highlights of the areas you may wish to discuss, followed by a slide showing one of the two grants awarded this year, which provided a roof for the one and only log cabin in Sedona. The third slide is about the emergency grant that you just passed, so you can discuss how the program responds to unforeseen conditions. Next is the national nomination of the Chapel of the Holy Cross, which is now going to the Keeper for consideration, and if it is accepted at the national level, it will be the fourth property in Sedona on the National Register.

Chairman Unger indicated that it could be a national landmark that could be on the registry, and asked if they were considering it beyond that level. Kathy explained that what we heard at the hearing was that this property could be a National Landmark; its first tier is to go to the National Register of Historic Places and the committee at the state level indicated that this should be a National Landmark, but she will have to check with the consultant about how to initiate that. Chairman Unger indicated that she understood it would be up to them, and they were going to go directly to landmarking and registration at the same time, which should take about a year, instead of three years. Kathy indicated she will follow-up with Bill Collins, and the Chairman noted that it is rare for them to even suggest that.

Kathy noted that the next slide covers the newest properties landmarked and she will try to add a photo of today's addition; then, we have Nancy Bartell's photos from the Historic Preservation Month event at the Eilenberg's house, so you can discuss your special events provided for education and outreach. The following slide is to discuss your role in reviewing current development projects, such as the Red Rock Village proposed where the Windsong Mobile Home Park is located, which enables you to discuss how you preserve and integrate them into new developments, and the last slide is to discuss the proposed incentive to add to the toolbox.

Chairman Unger recalled that last year each Commissioner took a topic, so she would suggest that perhaps Commissioner Mayer discuss Don Woods's work, and this will be just a sketch. Commissioner Wienges expressed interest in covering the Chapel of the Holy Cross, since she was there. Commissioner Mayer agreed to cover Don Woods's work, and Vice Chairman Ruland indicated that he would take incentives. The Chairman indicated that she will fill-in on the other topics, and asked how extensive we need to go into the grant issue. Kathy suggested that the Commission thank the Council for continuing to support that program and although it was reduced to \$12,000, we are still doing good work.

Vice Chairman Ruland suggested pointing out that the Commission has taken care of the ordinance for the last year; we shepherded it, revised it, refined it and helped protect the taxpayers' money, in addition to making it a more functional ordinance. Kathy made note of that suggestion and the fact that the Council passed that. Vice Chairman Ruland also indicated he would cover that topic too. The Chairman asked staff if the Commission should discuss how the Small Grant Program has been addressed or what the grants awarded were for. Vice Chairman Ruland indicated that he was referencing the changes to the landmark criteria, and the Chairman noted that we also made changes to the Small Grant Program. Kathy indicated that it could be mentioned in passing that it went before P&Z and Council to strengthen the landmark criteria, which could be folded into the discussion about the latest landmarks. Vice Chairman Ruland noted that it may take some study to discuss the grant recipients; however, Kathy indicated she can provide that information easily. Chairman Unger added that the changes in the Small Grant Program may not go with the landmarking changes; however, Kathy indicated that the flood touched

so many people, and it would be appropriate to discuss that the requirements were amended to respond to that property's need, because it is a property on the National Register of Historic Places. Vice Chairman Ruland indicated that it may have also calmed the owner about the City's responsibility. The Chairman suggested that Vice Chairman Ruland take the two first slides and join them together, and Kathy indicated that she can redo the PowerPoint to add the Ralph Block House and the photo of the Don Woods's home; Commissioner Mayer indicated he has a photo of that to give staff, and the Chairman suggested adding that after the new landmarked properties.

Commissioner Wienges indicated that she will talk to Kathy during the week to get the details on the Chapel of the Holy Cross, and the Chairman suggested adding Don Woods's work after the Chapel of the Holy Cross. Commissioner Mayer pointed out that the photographic display was previously presented to the City Council, and Kathy indicated she will strike that topic. Commissioner Mayer suggested saying that we completed it with the rest of the pictures and blueprints in the Building Department, and he will do that after talking about Don Woods's work.

Chairman Unger indicated she would cover the newly landmarked properties and the Historic Preservation Month's activities. She also noted that Modern Phoenix wants to start bus tours of some of those structures; however, Vice Chairman Ruland indicated he would not discuss that. Kathy pointed out that she would use the current development reviews as an opportunity to explain how you are involved with current planning, when historic resources are at stake. Vice Chairman Ruland agreed that it is important to say that, because we provide the expertise to the current planning staff. The Chairman suggested that she and the Vice Chairman could jointly cover that point, and we will probably all talk about the incentives, although Vice Chairman Ruland can initiate that discussion. The Vice Chairman indicated he would use the memo as the backdrop, and Kathy indicated that she would have that memo to share at the meeting. She also pointed out that the incentive may be controversial, as it relates to other neighborhood issues, and staff noted that it also could be inappropriately be linked to other proposals. The Chairman encouraged Commissioners to contact Kathy if there are any questions, and Kathy explained that the Commission doesn't need to know everything about incentives right now; we just need to know if we can start the research, because we don't have answers right now.

*No legal action was taken on this item.*

**10. Discussion/possible action on PowerPoint presentation prepared by staff as a community education tool and to assist in the recruitment of commission members.**

The Chairman indicated that this agenda item would be deferred until the December meeting in the interest of time, because staff has put a lot of work into this; therefore, there was no discussion on this item.

**11. Discussion/possible action on 2009-10 Commission Work Plan and commissioner involvement in Work Plan tasks:**

**a. Education and Public Outreach**

There was no discussion on this item.

**b. Survey Field Work**

There was no discussion on this item.

**c. Madole Home landmark prospects**

The Chairman noted that Jill Sands is actively talking to the Eilenbergs, and Commissioner Mayer added that she is also talking to the people on Last Wagon. The Chairman expressed thanks to Jill for her efforts, and Commissioner Mayer added that Mr. Eilenberg had not responded to his last email or called the other owners.

*No legal action was taken.*

**d. Early Don Woods-designed homes**

Commissioner Mayer indicated that he is currently working on a letter with Don Woods's photograph to send to the owners.

*No legal action was taken.*

**12. Discussion/possible action on:**

**a. Prospects for designation of landmarks or historic districts**

The Chairman indicated she has done research on Benny Gonzales and the building. Mr. Gonzales died last December, but she will defer the discussion until the next meeting. He has done a lot and is a well known architect throughout Arizona, and the first Hispanic to become a Certified Architect in Arizona. Included in the list of buildings he created is the Sedona Public Library, and there are churches, plus a \$1.5 Billion residence for a Saudi Arabia King, and the Monument Valley Inn, the Hopi Cultural Center, the Santa Cruz Public Library and the American Embassy renovation in Mexico City, etc.

*No legal action was taken.*

**b. Certificates of Appropriateness**

The Chairman referred an issue to staff regarding the information given to Doris Banks, because the roofer told her they don't have any material like that, and Kathy indicated she will follow-up and go to Pro-Build, and then she will talk with the roofer, because she had confirmed all three materials were available in white, opaque and green. The Chairman indicated she will also contact the secondary roofer and send Kathy his information.

*No legal action was taken.*

**c. Updates to Historic Resource Survey**

There was no discussion on this item.

*Note: No item d. was shown on the agenda.*

**e. Condition of Landmarks or other historic properties**

Kathy Levin indicated that Jill Sands called very excited to report that her house had been repainted and she wants the Commissioners to drive by; we should applaud her efforts to preserve that home.

*No legal action was taken.*

**13. Discussion/possible action regarding future meeting dates and future agenda items.**

The Chairman noted that we have the joint meeting next Monday, and for December 14th, we have the budget and the election of officers. Commissioner Mayer indicated that he will be gone during that time; therefore, Kathy noted that we may have to defer the December meeting, depending on the timing of new Commissioners being seated. The Chairman requested that staff notify the Commission as soon as the schedule is known.

**14. Adjournment.**

The Chairman called for adjournment at 6:00 p.m., without objection.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission held on November 2, 2009.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Donna A. S. Puckett, *Recording Secretary*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date